

September 28, 2009

Jane McCarter, Project Planner  
Department of Planning  
1 Harrison Street, S.E.  
P.O. Box 7000  
Leesburg, VA 20177-7000

**RE:** SPEX 2009-0004, SPEX 2009-0015 & CMPT 2009-0003  
Scott Jenkins Memorial Park  
**2<sup>nd</sup> Submission Referral Comments**



**VIRGINIA OFFICES:**

Chantilly  
Bridgewater  
Leesburg  
Virginia Beach  
Woodbridge

**LABORATORY:**

Chantilly

**MARYLAND OFFICES:**

Columbia  
Frederick  
Germantown  
Hollywood

**WEST VIRGINIA  
OFFICE:**

Martinsburg

T 800 553 PHRA

T 703 777 3616

F 703 777 3725

208 Church St., S.E.  
Leesburg, VA  
20175

Dear Ms. McCarter:

We have addressed the second referral comments for The Scott Jenkins Memorial Park and offer the following in response. The letter responds to the returned referrals in the chronological order they were written. In an effort to abbreviate the letter and focus on the addressing outstanding issues this letter only addresses items that need clarification and response from the applicant.

**Zoning Administration – June 2, 2009 (?)**

1. Cover Sheet. Note #7. As special exceptions are typically approved to be in substantial conformance with the special exception plan, revise Note #7 to state the reason that the location of the buildings, structures and parking lots could be subject to change, such as for engineering reasons.

**Response:** Note 7 on the cover sheet has been revised to state the final location of improvements is subject to change due to final engineering.

2. It is noted that the boundary line adjustment for the property was approved on August 5, 2009. Revise 19 accordingly.

**Response:** Note 19 has been amended as requested to note the BLAD approval date.

**Environmental Review Team (ERT) – September 4, 2009**

1. The special exception plat depicts restrooms and a trail approximately 8 to 10 feet from the "Moon Tree". Staff recommends that the restroom and trail be shifted to the east or relocated elsewhere on the property to ensure protection of the tree's critical root zone. The "Moon Tree" should be included as a tree save area or specified on the plat as an individual tree to be preserved. ERT recommends a condition of approval requiring the following: 1) no land disturbance within 20 feet of the tree; 2) 4-foot welded wire tree protection fence with "Tree Protection" signage in English and Spanish spaced no more than every 30 feet all the way around the tree protection fence; 3) a plaque explaining the tree's significance and history; and 4) no future site alteration within 30 feet of the tree. [Revised General Plan (RGP) Forest, Trees, and Vegetation Policy 1]



**Response:** The plan has been revised to save the 'Moon Tree'. It is agreed there will not be grading within 20' within Phase I development of the Park as well as no disturbance or future alteration within 30' of the tree as recommended. Conditions have been drafted to reflect this request.

2. For clarity, please include a legend on Sheet 3 identifying the tree save area symbol. In addition, staff recommends a condition of approval specifying the intent and limitations of the designated tree save areas, in addition to the specific measures for the "Moon Tree" identified above.

**Response:** Each Tree Conservation Area has been clearly noted on Sheet 3. In addition, the approval conditions have been included for the TCA's as well as the 'Moon Tree'.

3. The applicant's responses state that the absence of curb and gutter within the parking lot design and the use of grass swales increases time of flow for runoff to reach proposed stormwater management ponds, promoting infiltration. Staff agrees with this approach and recommends that the use of no curb and gutter in parking lot areas and grass swales to convey stormwater runoff be provided as a condition of approval. [RGP Surface Water Policy 5]

**Response:** Conditions have been included to state there will not be curb and gutter in the parking lot areas.

4. The applicant's responses state that the initial Phase 1 development, consisting solely of the large ball field, will require less than 6,700 gallons per day during a 30-day period, which is below the 10,000 gallons per day threshold referenced in Section 6.240 of the Facilities Standards Manual (FSM), requiring a hydrogeologic assessment. The responses go on to state that the applicant will commit to conducting a hydrogeologic assessment prior to construction of the irrigation system for the Phase 2 fields. Staff recommends that the assessment be provided as a condition of approval, to trigger the requirement at the time of the first site plan submittal. The condition will make it clear that the hydrogeologic assessment is required due to the water demand for both phases, collectively. Considering the limited water resources in this area of the County, it is important that the hydrogeologic assessment be conducted. [RGP Groundwater Policy 4]

**Response:** Conditions have been drafted to require a Hydrological Assessment prior to building permit for Phase II building construction.

5. The applicant's responses state that it is anticipated that the applicant shall install low flow fixtures and waterless urinals in the proposed restrooms. Staff recommends that these water conserving measures be included as a condition of approval. As previously stated, including water conservation measures within the project would establish a positive example of efficient water use in an area of the County with limited water resources and would be consistent with the Public Facilities goal language on Page 3-6 and General Water Policies on Page 2-20 of the RGP.

**Response:** Conditions have been drafted to require a low flow fixtures as well as waterless urinals.



6. In addition to the Noise Standards specified in Section 5-1507 of the Revised 1993 Loudoun County Zoning Ordinance, which is referenced in applicant's responses, staff recommends that the applicant address protection of the proposed park use from noise generated by Route 7. Based on Table 4-1 on page 4-8 of the Revised Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP), noise abatement measures should be considered if noise levels approach or exceed 67 decibels (dBA) for parks and active sport areas. The application should also consider noise generated from the park uses and impacts on adjacent properties. [CTP Noise Policy 2 and RGP Highway Noise Policies 1 and 3]

**Response:** The proposed additional landscape and screening will help abate additional noise from the proposed land use.

#### Community Planning – September 14, 2009

##### Lighting

*....Staff finds that the lighting for the proposed athletic fields is in compliance with the lighting and nightsky policies of the Revised General Plan. Staff recommends conditions of approval be developed to ensure the proposed lighting is in compliance with County standards and hours of illumination for the proposed athletic fields are limited to no later than 10:00 pm to mitigate potential impacts on adjacent residential properties.*

**Response:** The conditions have been drafted to limit the operations of the park until 11pm to allow time for users to safely exit the park.

#### Office of Transportation Services – September 24<sup>th</sup>, 2009

1. Resolved



2. Resolved
3. Resolved
4. Resolved
5. Resolved- appropriate language has been included in the conditions
6. Resolved- appropriate language has been included in the conditions
7. Resolved
8. Resolved- appropriate language has been included in the conditions
9. Resolved- appropriate language has been included in the conditions



Please find the attached 20 copies of the plan sets. Let us know if you have any questions regarding this resubmission. We look forward to seeing the successful completion of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,

Patton Harris Rust & Associates

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Mark Thomas', is written over a faint, larger version of the same signature.

Mark Thomas, CLA  
Director of Planning and Landscape Architecture